

1 BETSY C. MANIFOLD (182450)  
manifold@whafh.com  
2 RACHELE R. RICKERT (190634)  
rickert@whafh.com  
3 BRITTANY N. DEJONG (258766)  
dejong@whafh.com  
4 **WOLF HALDENSTEIN ADLER**  
**FREEMAN & HERZ LLP**  
5 750 B Street, Suite 2770  
San Diego, CA 92101  
6 Telephone: 619/239-4599  
Facsimile: 619/234-4599  
7

8 JANINE L. POLLACK (*pro hac vice*)  
pollack@whafh.com  
9 MICHAEL JAFFE (*pro hac vice*)  
jaffe@whafh.com  
10 GLORIA KUI MELWANI (*pro hac vice*)  
melwani@whafh.com  
11 **WOLF HALDENSTEIN ADLER**  
**FREEMAN & HERZ LLP**  
12 270 Madison Avenue  
New York, New York 10016  
13 Telephone: 212/545-4600  
Facsimile: 212/545-4653  
14 [additional counsel on signature page]

15 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA - SOUTHERN DIVISION**

16 DUANE ROBERT GREENE, SHAWN } Case No. 8:15-cv-01859-DOC-DFM  
17 RANDALL THOMAS, JAMES }  
18 HIRTZEL, ANTHONY SWETALA, and } **PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF**  
19 SPRAGUE SIMONDS on behalf of } **RECENT AUTHORITY**  
themselves and all others similarly } **REGARDING PENDING**  
situated, } **MOTION TO**  
20 } **DISMISS**  
21 Plaintiffs, }  
22 v. } Date: March 21, 2016  
23 FIVE PAWNS, INC., } Time: 8:30 a.m.  
24 } Courtroom: 9D  
25 Defendant. } Judge: Hon. David O. Carter  
26 }  
27 }  
28 }

1        Plaintiffs herein submit the following recent authority, which is relevant to  
 2 their opposition to the pending motion to dismiss for the following reasons:

3        1.    ***Hodsdon v. Mars, Inc., Case No. 15-cv-04450-RS, 2016 Dist.***  
 4            **LEXIS 19268, at \*14-24 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 27, 2016) (“*Hodsdon*”)**  
 5            **(attached hereto as Exhibit A).**

6        *Hodsdon*, consistent with this Court’s recent decision in *Wirth v. Mars, Inc.*,  
 7 No. SA CV 15-1470-DOC (KES), 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14552, at \*7-17 (C.D.  
 8 Cal. Feb. 5, 2016), cited by Defendant in its reply brief in support of its motion to  
 9 dismiss,<sup>1</sup> interprets Ninth Circuit authority as limiting a manufacturer’s disclosure  
 10 obligations under the California consumer protection statutes to *safety concerns*  
 11 when omissions (as opposed to misrepresentations) are alleged.<sup>2</sup>

12        To avoid any confusion of the issues, Plaintiffs’ claims here are based on  
 13 Defendant’s failure to disclose the presence and significant safety concerns relating  
 14 to its products.<sup>3</sup> *Plaintiffs do not pursue any cause of action based on*  
*15 misrepresentations.*

16        In addition, *Hodsdon* held that a plaintiff satisfies Article III standing if the  
 17 plaintiff alleges that he would not have purchased a product or paid as much for it  
 18 “if he had known the truth.” *Id.* at \*11 (citations omitted). “[T]he extra money  
 19 paid . . . is economic injury and affords the consumer standing to sue.” *Id.* at \* 9  
 20 (citing *Hinojos v. Kohl’s Corp.*, 718 F.3d 1098, 1104 (9th Cir. 2013)). Defendant

---

21  
 22        <sup>1</sup> ECF No. 24 at 10, 22-24 (filed March 7, 2016).

23        <sup>2</sup> In its reply, Defendant cites *Williams v. Yamaha Motor Corp., U.S.A.*, 106  
 24 F. Supp. 3d 1101, 1108 (C.D. Cal. 2015), in support of a rule requiring allegations  
 25 of a “design defect” whenever a “safety issue” is alleged. ECF No. 24 at 23.  
 26 However, obviously when a misrepresentation or omission does not concern a  
 27 product defect, a defect need not be alleged. *Williams* relied on *Wilson v. Hewlett-*  
*Packard Co.*, 668 F.3d 1136 (9th Cir. 2012). Both *Wilson* and *Williams* were  
 28 *defect* cases.

29        <sup>3</sup> ECF No. 23 at 8, 17-18 (filed February 22, 2016).

1 argues that Plaintiffs have not alleged standing because there is no allegation  
2 “pertaining to the awareness of the alleged omitted information,”<sup>4</sup> and, similarly,  
3 that Plaintiffs have not alleged reliance and causation with sufficient particularity.<sup>5</sup>  
4 However, it is alleged that Plaintiffs viewed the labeling of Defendant’s products  
5 and that they would have been aware of the information if it was disclosed and not  
6 have purchased Defendant’s products or paid as much for them.<sup>6</sup> Those allegations  
7 satisfy both Article III standing and Rule 9(b) under the applicable case law.

2. *Balser v. The Hain Celestial Group, Inc.*, No. 14-55074 (9th Cir. Feb. 22, 2016) (“*Balser*”) (memorandum) (attached hereto as Exhibit B).

In *Balser*, the Court held that claims brought under the consumer protection statutes of California and other states<sup>7</sup> were pled with sufficient particularity under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 9(b), where the plaintiffs had identified what they claimed to be misleading (packaging on a product that falsely indicated it was “natural”) as well as their reliance and harm (the plaintiffs would not have paid the same amount for the product if they had known the truth). *Id.* at \*2-3. The *Balser* Court noted that “whether a business practice is deceptive, misleading or unfair is ordinarily a question of fact to be decided by a jury,” and that even a complete ingredient list on the package or on the manufacturer’s website does not correct a misrepresentation on a product’s label as a matter of law. *Id.* at \*4.

20 Here, the First Amended Complaint identifies exactly what was misleading

23 | 4 ECF No. 24 at 14.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* at 16-18.

<sup>6</sup> ECF No. 13 at ¶ 26-31, 125, 134, 145-146, 158, 167.

<sup>7</sup> In its opinion in *Balser*, the Ninth Circuit did not identify the consumer statutes that it was addressing. The underlying complaint in *Balser* can be found on the Ninth Circuit's docket, Case 2:13-cv-05604-R-RZ (September 30, 2013), Docket No. 18.

1 (the absence of any mention of two dangerous substances on product labeling),<sup>8</sup> as  
2 well as Plaintiffs' reliance and harm (Plaintiffs viewed the packages that omitted  
3 the presence and significant health risks of DA and AP and would not have paid as  
4 much for Defendant's products or purchased them at all if the omitted information  
5 had been provided).<sup>9</sup> Moreover, the disclosure of the levels of the allegedly  
6 dangerous substances on Defendants' website (many months after Defendant's  
7 testing, and with no warnings as to any dangers)<sup>10</sup> does not serve to correct the  
8 omission as a matter of law.

9 DATED: March 15, 2016

10 **WOLF HALDENSTEIN ADLER  
FREEMAN & HERZ LLP**

11 By: /s/ Rachele R. Rickert  
12 RACHELE R. RICKERT

13 BETSY C. MANIFOLD  
14 manifold@whafh.com  
15 RACHELE R. RICKERT  
16 rickert@whafh.com  
17 BRITTANY N. DEJONG  
dejong@whafh.com  
750 B Street, Suite 2770  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Telephone: 619/239-4599  
Facsimile: 619/234-4599

18 **WOLF HALDENSTEIN ADLER  
FREEMAN & HERZ LLP**  
19 JANINE L. POLLACK (*pro hac vice*)  
20 pollack@whafh.com  
21 MICHAEL JAFFE (*pro hac vice*)  
jaffe@whafh.com  
22 GLORIA KUI MELWANI (*pro hac vice*)  
melwani@whafh.com  
23 270 Madison Avenue  
New York, New York 10016  
Telephone: 212/545-4600  
Facsimile: 212/545-4653

25  
26 <sup>8</sup> ECF No. 13 at ¶¶ 62, 65 (filed December 14, 2015).

27 <sup>9</sup> *Id.* at ¶¶ 18, 112, 125, 145, 158, 167, 176.

28 <sup>10</sup> *Id.* at ¶¶ 51, 70-71, 74.

1 **ANDERSEN SLEATER LLC**  
2 JESSICA J. SLEATER (*pro hac vice*)  
3 jessica@andersensleater.com  
4 1345 Avenue of the Americas  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Suite 2100  
New York, New York 10105  
Telephone: 212/878-3697

5 *Counsel for Plaintiffs Duane Robert Greene,*  
6 *Shawn Randall Thomas, James Hirtzel,*  
7 *Anthony Swetala and Dr. Sprague Simonds*

785887

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28